

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7-10, 12-13, 16, 19, 21, 23 and 25 have been amended.

All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure, no new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-25 remain pending.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-12, 16, and 19-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,596,739, to Kane et al. ("Kane"). In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7-10, 12, 16, 19, 21, 23 and 25.

Kane teaches a privilege level 2 task (TSK2) using an ARPL instruction, an instruction of the processor, to adjust the RPL of a provided selector to match the CPL of a privilege level 3 task (TSK3) (see, col. 18, 52-54). Thus, the task is involved, and the operating system is involved.

Accordingly, claims 1, 7, 16, 19, 21, 23 and 25 are not obvious in view of Kane, and therefore patentable over Kane under sec 103(a).

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 20, 22, 24 and 26 are dependent on independent claims 1, 7, 19, 21, 23 and 25, incorporating their limitations, respectively. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 2-6, 8-12, 20, 22, 24 and 26 are patentable over Kane, under sec 103(a).

Rejection of claims 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,916,385, to Parmar, in view of Kane. In response, independent claim 13 has been similarly amended to contain in

substance the same limitations as claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 13 is patentable over Kane. Parmar does not remedy the deficiency of Kane. Therefore, claim 13 remains patentable over Kane, even when combined with Parmar.

Claim 15 depends upon claim 13, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 15 is patentable over Kane and Parmar combined.

Rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parmar. Claim 14 depends on claim 13 which is patentable over Parmar, as Parmar suffers the same deficiencies as earlier discussed for Kane. So, for at least the same reasons, claim 14 is patentable over Parmar.

Objection of Claims 17 and 18

Claims 17 and 18 stand objected to for being dependent upon rejected base claims, but otherwise allowable. While claims 17 and 18 depend on claim 16 and are therefore patentable without having to be written in independent form, Applicant has nonetheless rewritten claim 17 to independent form by incorporating all of the limitations of claim 16 pursuant to the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 18 depends on now allowable claim 17. Therefore, claim 18 is no longer dependent on rejected claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Please charge deposit account No. 500393, if there is any deficiency in fees required for the filing, and likewise credit the same account for any excess payment of fees.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT

Dated: April 7, 2005



Mark C McClure
Reg No. 53,857